

Appl. No. 10/628,017
Amdt. Dated April 12, 2005
Reply to Office Action of December 2, 2004

•••REMARKS/ARGUMENTS•••

The Official Action of December 2, 2004 has been thoroughly studied. Accordingly, the changes presented herein for the application, considered together with the following remarks, are believed to be sufficient to place the application into condition for allowance.

By the present amendment, the limitations of claim 2 have been incorporated into claim 1 and claim 2 has accordingly been canceled.

In addition, claim 3 has been changed to depend from claim 1 rather than canceled claim 2.

Entry of the changes to the claims is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 2 are pending in this application.

Claims 1-3 stand provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over co-pending application serial no. 10/627,266.

Claims 1-3 stand provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over co-pending application serial no. 10/627,267.

In response to the provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejections which were repeated from the Official Action mailed June 28, 2004, applicant filed a Terminal Disclaimer on January 17, 2004 in which the terminal part of any application issuing on the present application

Appl. No. 10/628,017
Amdt. Dated April 12, 2005
Reply to Office Action of December 2, 2004

which would extend beyond the term of any patent issuing on co-pending application serial no. 10/627,266 or co-pending application serial no. 10/627,267 was disclaimed.

The undersigned has verified from the PTO's PAIR system that the Terminal Disclaimer was received by the Examiner.

It is submitted that the Terminal Disclaimer overcomes the obviousness-type double patenting rejections of the claims.

Claim 1 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by or, in the alternative under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 3,316,287 or G.B. 1,090,565 both to Nunn, Jr. et al.

The Nunn, Jr. et al. references were not relied upon to reject claims 2 or 3.

Accordingly, inasmuch as the limitations of claim 2 have been incorporated into independent claim 1, it is submitted that independent claim 1 and claim 3 which depends therefrom are free from any prior art rejections, it being noted that the prior art of record does not teach the use of an amino group-containing compound which applicant has discovered gives excellent effects on the release agent of the present invention.

Entry of the present Supplemental Amendment and an early allowance of the claims are earnestly solicited.

It is believed that the above represents a complete response to the Official Action and reconsideration is requested.


If upon consideration of the above, the Examiner should feel that there remain

Appl. No. 10/628,017
Amdt. Dated April 12, 2005
Reply to Office Action of December 2, 2004

outstanding issues in the present application that could be resolved; the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' patent counsel at the telephone number given below to discuss such issues.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR §1.136 is hereby made. Please charge the fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 12-2136 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael S. Gzybowski
Reg. No. 32,816

BUTZEL LONG
350 South Main Street
Suite 300
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104
(734) 995-3110

126563.1